



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,153	10/27/2003	Eric Edward Lennon	KCX-1359 (18231)	3016
7590 Mr. Stephen E. Bondura Dority & Manning, P.A. P.O. Box 1449 Greenville, SC 29602			EXAMINER BUTLER, PATRICK NEAL	
			ART UNIT 1742	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/23/2012	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* ERIC LENNON, THOMAS BROCK,  
BRYAN HAYNES, and DOUGLAS HULSLANDER

---

Appeal 2010-005996  
Application 10/694,153  
Technology Center 1700

---

Before CHUNG K. PAK, CHARLES F. WARREN, and  
ROMULO H. DELMENDO, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PAK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.52(a)(1), Appellants request rehearing of our Decision of June 29, 2012 (“Decision”), affirming the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 11, and 23 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application 10/687,006 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,504,060 B2). (*See* the Request for Rehearing (“Req.”) dated July 9, 2012, 1-2.)

Appellants specifically request that:

[T]he Board to reconsider its affirmance of rejection (11) [sic, rejection (12)] for obviousness-type double patenting. The affirmance is believed to be improper because as expressly stated in the Advisory Action mailed on June 2, 2009, the

obviousness-type double patenting rejection was overcome by the argument on pages 8-9 of applicants' March 2009 Response to Final Office Action. Thus, this obviousness-type double patenting rejection was eliminated from the case. Accordingly, the Board lacked jurisdiction over any such obviousness-type double patenting rejection. [(See Req. 1.)]

Contrary to Appellants' arguments, however, the Examiner has never withdrawn the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 23 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application 10/687,006 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,504,060 B2) set forth in the final Office ("FA") action dated March 3, 2009 and the Answer ("Ans.") dated November 9, 2009. As acknowledged by Appellants at page 2 of the Request for Rehearing, the Advisory Action ("AA"), mailed June 2, 2009, indicates that only "the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 11, 23 over claims 1, 5, and 11 of US. Patent No. 7,448,411 B2" was withdrawn. (See also AA 2, FA 4, Ans. 3 and Decision 2, footnote 3.)

It follows that the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 11, and 23 over claim 1 of copending Application 10/687,006 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,504,060 B2) maintained in the Answer was properly before us.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we find no reversible error in our Decision affirming the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

---

<sup>1</sup> Even if the Examiner has erroneously not designated any obviousness-type double patenting rejection set forth in the Answer as a new ground of rejection, it is properly before us when Appellants fail to file a petition in a timely manner to designate the rejection as a new ground of rejection and/or fail to choose an option to further prosecute before the Examiner.

rejection of claims 1, 11, and 23 as unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application 10/687,006 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,504,060 B2).

In conclusion, based on the foregoing, we have granted Appellants' request to the extent that we have reconsidered our Decision, but we deny Appellants' request to make any change therein.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

DENIED

sld